

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/835,400 04/17/2001		George Hamilton Harvey	52090.000376	5160		
7590 10/18/2006			EXAMINER			
Thomas J. Scott, Jr., Esq.			SPOONER, LAMONT M			
Hunton & Will:	iams					
Suite 1200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
1900 K Street, N.W.			2626	2626		
Washington, WA 20006			DATE MAIL ED. 10/19/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application I	Application No. Applicant(s)		-				
Office Action Summary			09/835,400		HARVEY ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Lamont M. Sp	ooner	2626				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appe	ears on the co	ver sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINIOR OF THE MINIOR OF THE MINIOR OF THE MONTHS from the mailing date of this common of the properties of the provisions of the months of the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DA of 37 CFR 1.13 nunication. atutory period wi will, by statute,	ATE OF THIS 6(a). In no event, I ill apply and will ex cause the applicati	COMMUNICATIO nowever, may a reply be tin pire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 03 Au	iaust 2006						
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 August 2006</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)									
٥,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-17 and 24-28</u> is/are pending in the application.								
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) 14-17 is/are allowed.								
· · · —	Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 24-28</u> is/are rejected.								
7)									
8)□									
Applicati	on Papers								
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	e Evaminer							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•							
	•	for foreian ı	priority under	35 U.S.C. & 119(a)-(d) or (f)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		41	☐ Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P		Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate					
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		-11	─	formal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6)									

Application/Control Number: 09/835,400

Art Unit: 2626

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/06/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

More specifically, in response to applicant's arguments, regarding claim 1, the Examiner notes that, the roots taught in the specification, p.6.[7], as designated do not teach one of ordinary skill in the art, how to combine the roots (BASE, ALT, SRC, DST, MOD), to form a word. Despite in applicant's specification, p.2.[3] "The roots are combined to form words." The Examiner notes in [3] applicant teaches of representations of characteristics, definitions or meanings, with no where in the disclosure the teaching of how to combine a root to form a word. The Examiner advises the applicant to explicitly point out in the disclosure where a word is formed from the combination of roots.

Claim 24 is unpersuasive as it contains similar subject matter as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-13, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the disclosure in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In claim 1, lines 8 and 7, "grouping a plurality roots selected from the set of roots to form a word" is not enabled by the spec. The Examiner is unable to determine from the disclosure how the word is formed. from the roots. More specifically, in the disclosure, specification, page 6, para [7], lines 1 and 2, "Roots are combined to define words", page 7, para [8] line 6-9, "by combining roots in this multidimensional manner, each value for each field has significant meaning. Each root narrows the meaning of each word, yet each root may be processed in a similar manner and in parallel to extract the meaning of the word". Page 9, [12], line 1, "Each word is comprised of roots that provide meaning to the words.". The Examiner notes that the combined roots do not form a word in any of the broadest sense of interpretation, wherein the forming of a word comprises generating

Art Unit: 2626

the word and not the definition or meanings or grouped meanings of the word. The Examiner advises the applicant to specify where in disclosure a word is formed from the roots.

Claims 18, 24-27 set forth similar limitations and therefore rejected for the same reasons and under the same rationale. Claims 2-7, and 28 are rejected as being dependent upon their rejected parent claims.

In claim 8, "dividing all knowledge" is without bound, wherein the applicant does not provide enablement for "all" knowledge known to mankind.

Claims 9-13 are rejected as being dependent upon their rejected parent claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 14-17 are allowed.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claim 14 is allowable over the closest prior art of record, Kavanagh et al. (US 5,838,965) and which teaches a database management system including a plurality of fields with readable values, concepts in a hierarchical structure. The improvement comprising, a plurality of roots, as

Application/Control Number: 09/835,400

Art Unit: 2626

defined in the specification, a most significant and lesser significant field filled with a readable value designating a general abstract concept and a narrower concept within the narrower concept, respectively, each root designating a concept indicated by the value of each field included in the

Page 5

root, and a word including the plurality of roots, each concept designated by each root of the plurality of roots designating a different characteristic of the word.

Claims 15-17 are allowed as their parent claim has been deemed allowable.

Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Kavanagh et al. (US 5,838,965) teaches object oriented representation of information, hierarchical classes representation of objects.
 - Gibson et al. (US 5,737,732) teaches of a metatree data structure
 - Murray et al. (US 7016,905) teaches of hierarchical organization of a database.

Application/Control Number: 09/835,400 Page 6

Art Unit: 2626

Copperman et al. (US 2004/0024739) teaches of a taxonomy,
 root concept nodes, knowledge mapped, alternate roots, and
 database structure and representations of these informations.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RICHEMOND DORVIL

lms 10/13/06